



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/745,607	12/20/2000	Ana Reyes	155698-000	1211

22242 7590 07/27/2004

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

SHELEHEDA, JAMES R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/745,607

Applicant(s)

REYES ET AL.

Examiner

James Sheleheda

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims 7 and 17, line 8 (as currently amended), "selecting said key" should be changed to --selecting a key--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 9-13, 16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau et al. (Dureau) (US2002/0056112) in view of Nykerk (5,883,680) and Han (6,111,518).

As to claim 1, Dureau discloses a method for controlling the transmission of control information to an input device (paragraph 45, lines 1-8) in an entertainment system (Fig. 3), comprising: **receiving** programming data associated with a broadcast channel (paragraph 41), **displaying** a show associated with the channel (paragraph 41, lines 23-27). While Dureau discloses configuring an input device (paragraph 45, lines 1-8, paragraph 61), he fails to disclose wherein the input device is configured to operate

Art Unit: 2614

in a first mode that suspends transmission of all channel selection input control information to the entertainment system.

In an analogous art, Nykerk discloses a television remote control (Fig. 4A) which is configured to "lock" **user defined keys** on the remote (or a first "lock" mode; column 12, lines 25-40) to ensure that signals associated with those keys are not transmitted (by ignoring the pressing of those keys, column 12, lines 37-40) for the benefit of enabling parental control over keys and channels to which a remote control will allow access (column 12, lines 20-24).

Additionally, in an analogous art, Han discloses a cable television system (Fig. 3) wherein **all** key input from a remote control (Fig. 4A) is locked out (including channel selection; column 2, lines 65-67 and column 3, lines 1-2) after a user depresses a locking key (column 2, lines 31-37) for the benefit of enabling parental control over a child's use of the remote.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau's method to include wherein the input device is configured to operate in a mode that suspends transmission of channel selection input control information to the entertainment system, as taught by Nykerk, for the benefit of enabling parents to lock out their children from accessing particular remote control keys.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau and Nykerks's method to include suspending all input control information, as taught by Han, for the benefit enabling a parent to prevent children from inputting undesired channel change information.

As to claim 11, Dureau discloses an entertainment system (Fig. 3) comprising: a **display monitor** (Fig. 3, TV, 51); and a **broadcast receiver** (receiver, 50) coupled to the display monitor (Fig. 3), the broadcast receiver including: a **front end unit** (Fig. 6, Processing unit, 60) capable of receiving programming data associated with a show broadcast for viewing on the display monitor (paragraph 41), a **memory** (Fig. 6, ROM 65 or RAM 66), and a **central processing unit** (processor, 64) coupled to the memory (Fig. 6, using bus 63), the central processing unit coupled to receive programming data associated with a broadcast channel (paragraph 40, lines 1-5; paragraph 41), the central processing unit to execute software to display a show associated with the channel (paragraph 44). While Dureau discloses wherein said central processing unit can is instructed when to execute software to configure an input device (paragraph 45, lines 1-8, paragraph 61), he fails to disclose wherein the input device is configured to operate in a first mode that suspends transmission of input control information to the entertainment system.

In an analogous art, Nykerk discloses a television remote control (Fig. 4A) which is configured to "lock" **user defined keys** on the remote (or a first "lock" mode; column 12, lines 25-40) to ensure that signals associated with those keys are not transmitted (by ignoring the pressing of those keys, column 12, lines 37-40) for the benefit of enabling parental control over keys and channels to which a remote control will allow access (column 12, lines 20-24).

Additionally, in an analogous art, Han discloses a cable television system (Fig. 3) wherein **all** key input from a remote control (Fig. 4A) is locked out (including channel selection; column 2, lines 65-67 and column 3, lines 1-2) after a user depresses a locking key (column 2, lines 31-37) for the benefit of enabling parental control over a child's use of the remote.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau's method to include wherein the input device is configured to operate in a mode that suspends transmission of channel selection input control information to the entertainment system, as taught by Nykerk, for the benefit of enabling parents to lock out their children from accessing particular remote control keys.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau and Nykerk's method to include suspending all input control information, as taught by Han, for the benefit enabling a parent to prevent children from inputting undesired channel change information.

As to claims 2 and 12, while Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose configuring said input device to operate in the first mode, they fail to specifically disclose the displaying of a message concerning the input device's operational mode.

In an analogous art, Han further discloses a receiver (Fig. 3) that will display a warning message describing the locked status of a remote control (Fig. 5, step 506; column 3, lines 59-65). This provides the typical benefit of notifying a user as to the current status of a device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to further modify Dureau, Nykerk and Han's system to include the displaying of a message concerning the input device's operational mode, as further taught by Han, for the typical advantage of notifying a television user as to the current status of their input device.

As to claims 3 and 13, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose wherein said message is displayed for a predetermined period of time (See Han at column 3, lines 10-13 and lines 59-65; wherein the warning/status messages must be for some set duration).

As to claims 6 and 16, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose receiving an instruction to configure the input device to operate in a second mode that facilitates unlimited transmission of input control information to the entertainment system (See Nykerk at column 12, lines 41-50).

As to claims 9 and 19, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose terminating transmission of all input control information to said entertainment system entered via said input device (wherein key inputs are not transmitted during the programming of the remote; See Nykerk at column 12, lines 25-40).

As to claims 10 and 20, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose reactivating transmission of all input control information to said entertainment system entered via

said input device (See Nykerk at column 12, lines 40-50) upon selection of a dedicated key on said input device (See Nykerk at column 12, lines 40-50; "unlock key", 80).

4. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau, Nykerk and Han as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Ellis et al. (Ellis) (US2001/0010095).

As to claims 4 and 14, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose wherein configuring the input device comprises:

selecting a key on said input device (See Nykerk at column 12, lines 25-27) following the selection of at least one option (wherein the user made the decision to "lock" their remote; see Nykerk at column 12, lines 13-24); and

prompting (by illuminating an LED) the user to enter a password (See Nykerk at column 12, lines 25-30).

While Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose facilitating configuration of the input device to operate in said first mode that suspends transmission of input control information to the entertainment system (the "lock" mode) using a lock button (see Nykerk at column 12, lines 13-15), they fail to disclose displaying a menu having at least one option to facilitate the configuration.

In an analogous art, Ellis discloses an entertainment system (Fig. 1, user equipment, 32) wherein any function of dedicated remote control keys (such as a remote control "lock" key) can be provided in the form of menu options presented to the

user for selection (paragraph 37). This provides the typical benefit of enabling a user to perform any function using easily navigable display menus.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau, Nykerk and Han's system to include displaying a menu having at least one option to facilitate the configuration, as taught by Ellis, for the typical benefit of enabling a television user to perform any remote control function (such as locking) using easily navigable display menus.

5. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau, Nykerk and Han as applied to claims 6 and 16 above, and further in view of Ellis.

As to claims 7 and 17, Dureau, Nykerk and Han disclose wherein receiving said instruction to configure the input device to operate in the second mode comprises:

selecting said option that facilitates configuration of said input device to operate in said second mode (wherein the user makes the decision to "unlock" their remote; see Nykerk at column 12, lines 41-45);

selecting a key on said input device following the selection of said option (unlock key; see Nykerk at column 12, lines 25-27);

prompting (by illuminating an LED) the user to enter a password (see Nykerk at column 12, lines 25-30); and

confirming the validity of said password (Wherein the unlocking password must be the same as the original locking password, See Nykerk at column 12, lines 45-47).

While Dureau and Nykerk disclose facilitating configuration of the input device to operate in said second mode that facilitates unlimited transmission of input control information to the entertainment system (the "unlocked" mode), they fail to disclose displaying a menu having at least one option that facilitates configuration of said input device and selecting the at least one option.

In an analogous art, Ellis discloses an entertainment system (Fig. 1, user equipment, 32) wherein any function of dedicated remote control keys (such as a remote control "unlock" key) can be provided in the form of menu options presented to the user for selection (paragraph 37). This provides the typical benefit of enabling a user to perform any function using easily navigable display menus.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau, Nykerk and Han's system to include displaying a menu having at least one option to facilitate the configuration, as taught by Ellis, for the typical benefit of enabling a television user to perform any remote control function (such as unlocking) using easily navigable display menus.

6. Claims 5, 8, 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau, Nykerk, Han and Ellis as applied to claim 4 and 7 above, and further in view of Lownes et al. (Lownes) (6,137,539).

As to claims 5 and 15, while Dureau, Nykerk and Ellis disclose the selecting of said first mode, they fail to specifically disclose the displaying of a status key indicating the mode selected.

In an analogous art, Lownes discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) wherein a set top terminal (DTV-STB, 90) will send a command to a device (D-VHS, 113) to change states (Fig. 4, steps 410-416, column 8, lines 58-67 and column 9, lines 1-10) and wherein the current state of the device is then displayed (Figs. 5 and 6, column 9, lines 51-62). This would provide the typical benefit of notifying a user as to the current status of any devices in use.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau, Nykerk, Han and Ellis' system to include the displaying of a status key indicating the mode selected, as taught by Lownes, for the typical benefit of notifying a user as to the current status of any devices in use.

As to claims 8 and 18, while Dureau, Nykerk, Han and Ellis disclose the selecting of said first mode, they fail to specifically disclose the displaying of a message indicating the input device is configured to operate in the selected mode.

In an analogous art, Lownes discloses a digital television system (Fig. 1) where a set top terminal (DTV-STB, 90) will send a command to a device (D-VHS, 113) to change states (Fig. 4, steps 410-416, column 8, lines 58-67 and column 9, lines 1-10) and wherein the current state of the device is then displayed (Figs. 5 and 6, column 9, lines 51-62) This would provide the typical benefit of notifying a user as to the current status of any devices in use.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Dureau, Nykerk, Han and Ellis' system to include the

displaying of a message indicating the input device is configured to operate in the selected mode, as taught by Lownes, for the typical benefit of notifying a user as to the current status of any devices in use.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 05/11/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) Applicant states on page 9, lines 18-28 (of the amendment) that the rejection was contradictory and that the disclosure does teach "displaying a menu having an option that facilitates configuration of the input device."

In response, the rejection was not towards the teaching of the display, but in the required order of events. The displayed menu is clearly defined to configure the input device **prior** to a user selecting a key and entering the password. The original order the steps implied a functionality which was undefined in the specification.

(2) As to claims 1 and 11,

(a) Applicant argues on page 10, lines 23-24 (of the amendment) "Neither the Dureau nor the Nykerk references teach or suggest configuring the input device to operate in a first mode,...".

In response, Nykerk states "These keys 88, 90 and an appropriate control routine in the microcontroller 12 (Fig. 1) allow the user of the remote control

device to “lock out” and “unlock” any of the pre-labeled network keys 50 or the channel group keys 52...” This meets the “configuring the input device to operate in a first mode” limitation of the claim.

(b) Applicant argues on page 10, lines 23-25 (of the amendment) “Neither the Dureau nor the Nykerk references teach or suggest configuring the input device...to operate in a first mode to suspend transmission of all channel selection input control information.”

This argument has been considered but is moot in view of (a) above and the new ground(s) of rejection.

(c) Applicant argues on page 10, lines 25-27 that “Further, the Nykerk reference specifically teaches away from the configuring of an input device to operate in a first mode to suspend transmission of all of the channel selection input control information.” More specifically, Applicant states that the Nykerk reference provides for specific predefined key to be selected by a user to be locked (see amendment at page 11, lines 10-12) and wherein the other channel selection keys continue to operate normally to transmit control information (see amendment at page 11, lines 15-19).

In response, while Nykerk doesn't specifically disclose suspending transmission of **all** channel selection input control information, there is nothing within Nykerk would make one unable to implement this feature or any reason

why this feature would be undesirable. Nykerk suggests locking out some channel keys to prevent unauthorized access to those specific keys (see Nykerk at column 12, lines 22-24). This in no way teaches away from the possibility of locking out all of the channel keys.

(3) As to claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19 and 20, Applicants arguments have been considered but are moot in view of (1)(a) above and the new ground(s) of rejection.

(4) As to claims 4 and 14,

(a) Applicant argues on page 13, lines 22-25 (of the amendment) "The Ellis reference also fails to teach or suggest configuring an input device as recited in claims 1 and 11. Alternatively, the Ellis reference describes a channel guide displayed on a television and does not describe configuring an input device."

Applicants arguments have been considered but are moot in view of (1)(a) above and the new ground(s) of rejection.

(b) Applicant argues on page 13, lines 22-25 (of the amendment) "Further, the Ellis reference fails to teach at least "displaying a menu having at least one option that facilitates configuration of said input device...", as recited in claims 4 and 14." More specifically, Applicant states that the Ellis reference describes

displaying functions that are similar to functions provided on a remote control.
(see amendment at page 14, lines 1-2).

In response, Nykerk discloses the use of a lock key (88) which will configure the remote control to enter a lock mode (first mode) wherein channel keys are locked (see Nykerk at column 12, lines 13-24) and no longer transmit input control information (wherein the button presses are ignored; see Nykerk at column 12, lines 35-40). This meets the “facilitates configuration of the input device to operate in said first mode that suspends transmission of input control information to the entertainment system” as recited in the claim. Ellis teaches wherein various control buttons on a remote control (such as Nykerk’s lock button) can be provided in the form of suitable menu options that a user selects using arrow keys and an “OK” button (see Ellis at paragraph 37). Providing the functionality of Nykerk’s lock button into a displayed menu option then meets the “displaying a menu having at least one option that facilitates configuration of said input device” limitation as claimed.

(c) Applicant argues on page 13, lines 2-3, that “None of the displayed functions allow or suggest allowing the configuring of a remote control.”

In response, Ellis specifically states that remote control functions other than those specifically recited (such as Nykerk’s lock button) could also be incorporated into a display menu (see paragraph 37, lines 2-4).

(d) Applicant argues on page 14, lines 7-12, that one skilled in the art would not combine the Ellis reference with Nykerk and Dureau because they are related to different subject matter (see amendment at page 14, lines 8-9) and would be considered non-analogous art (see amendment at page 14, lines 10-12).

In response to applicant's argument that Ellis is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Ellis and the combination of Nykerk and Dureau both contain television systems (see Dureau at paragraph 24; Fig. 2 and Ellis at Fig. 1; paragraph 27) wherein programming is received at a receiver (22; see Dureau at paragraph 24 and Ellis at paragraph 32, lines 1-7) and wherein a remote control is utilized to transmit control signals to the receiver (see Dureau at paragraph 61 and Ellis at paragraph 34). This clearly indicates that the references are indeed analogous art.

(e) Applicant argues on page 14, lines 12-13, that "The Ellis reference provides no motivation to combine with the Dureau and Nykerk references."

Art Unit: 2614

In response to applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Ellis provides for the incorporating various control buttons on a remote control into the form of menu options (see Ellis at paragraph 37). The use of an on-screen display as a means to provide a convenient, user friendly interface for a television viewer is notoriously well known in the art.

(5) As to claims 7 and 17, see (5) above.

(6) As to claims 5, 8, 15 and 18,

(a) As to Applicant's arguments concerning the configuration of the input device (see amendment at page 15, lines 8-18), Applicants arguments have been considered but are moot in view of (1)(a) above and the new ground(s) of rejection.

(b) Applicant argues on page 15, lines 22-23, "There is no suggestion in Lownes that the status be applied to an input device, not does Lownes suggest configuring an input device."

In response, the VCR in Lownes is a device which is inputting an MPEG transport stream to the set top box (see Lownes at column 2, lines 53-57). It therefore more than meets the claim limitation of "input device".

(c) Applicant argues on page 15, lines 23-25, that one skilled in the art would not combine the Lownes reference with Nykerk and Dureau because they are directed to unrelated technology (see amendment at page 15, lines 23-25).

In response to applicant's argument that Lownes is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, Lownes and the combination of Nykerk and Dureau both contain television systems (see Dureau at paragraph 24; Fig. 2 and Lownes at Fig. 1A; column 2, lines 48-65) wherein programming is received at a receiver (22; see Dureau at paragraph 24 and Lownes at column 2, lines 48-57) and wherein a remote control is utilized to transmit control signals to the receiver (see

Dureau at paragraph 61 and Lownes at paragraph 34). This clearly indicates that the references are indeed analogous art.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Art Unit: 2614

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (703) 305-8722. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James Sheleheda
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2614

JS



JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600